



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

LYSIAS xxiv. 14

The manuscript reading—οὐθ' οὗτος εἶ ποιῶν—has created a general dissatisfaction among the editors. Emendations, or suggestions, are: the insertion of ὑμῖν after οὗτος (Frohnb., Thal., Adams); οὐθ' ὅστις εἶ φρονῶν (Markl., Westr.); εἶ νοῶν (Sauppe); εἶ φρονῶν (Rauch., Bristol); οὐθ' οὗτος ὑμῖν ὡς εἶ ποιῶν (Scheibe, but he retains MS reading in text); οὐθ' οὗτος ὑμῖν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ παρανοῶν (or εἶ ποιῶν) κτλ. (P. R. Müller); οὐθ' οὗτος σπουδάζει (Naber, Halbertsma, who conjecture that the copyist, finding a lacuna, volunteered εἶ ποιῶν, and cite § 18 for support); οὐθ' οὗτος εὐλογα δοκεῖ ποιεῖν (Jebb); the insertion of ἐαυτῷ after οὗτος (Kayser); and a mere indication of a lacuna in the text (Morgan).

The phrase probably involves an intentional ambiguity; and, if so, emendation is not only unnecessary but actually subversive of thought and purpose. A proper perspective and a willingness not to insist upon an ironclad translation leads naturally to this point of view.

The key to the whole speech is the art of ἡθοποιία. In keeping with the character and manners of the cripple, Lysias has equipped his utterances with gentle irony, with playful humor, with outbursts of sarcasm, and with stings, bitter and abrupt. But the real "hits" are made in two ambiguities—the one coarse and side-splitting, the other subtle and contemptuous, namely, εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς μακροτέρας τῶν ἀναγκαίων (§ 10), and the present instance. Exact translation produces the effect of neither.

If, in thought, one inserts ὑμῖν, a striking tautology results; and if one inserts ἐαυτῷ, the phrase smacks of philosophy and is therefore worthy of our hero: for is he not a philosopher (εἰκὸς . . . φιλοσοφεῖν, § 10) and may he not differentiate between his opponent's inner self and the rôle he is now playing? The ellipsis itself is significant. Then comes the abrupt εἶ ποιῶν and its sting (cf. εἰκότως, § 3; τί τοῦτου διοίσω, § 3; οὐ σπουδάζων, ἀλλὰ παίζων, "kidding," § 18; ὥσπερ τι καλὸν ποιῶν, § 18; ὁμοίως τούτῳ, § 21). The *double entendre* in εἶ ποιῶν consists in the two possible meanings, "fortunately" (as often in the orators, Plato and Aristophanes) and "and it is a good thing" (cf. *Or.* xxxii. 17). Thus we have two possible thoughts: the thought standing in the background, "nor does he really agree with himself, fortunately" (for his mental condition); and the more obvious thought which leads directly to the γάρ clause following, "nor does he agree with you, and it is a good thing" that he doesn't, for otherwise he wouldn't be following up a very lucrative hope—the dowry of my infirmity!

It may be added that the emendation to εὖ φρονῶν—based upon εὐφρονούτων below—is objectionable for two reasons: (1) the copyist could hardly have corrected εὖ φρονῶν to εὖ ποιῶν; and (2) the cripple could not consistently reflect so directly upon his opponent's sanity in view of the statement in § 10: Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς ἱππικῆς, ἧς οὗτος ἐτόλμησε μνησθῆναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, οὔτε τὴν τύχην δέισας οὔτε ὑμᾶς αἰσχυνθείς, οὐ πολλὸς ὁ λόγος. In fact, by indirection εὐφρονούτων supports the MS reading; for it, too, hints that the opponent is unbalanced.

PLATO APOLOGY 29A

δεινὸν τὰν εἶη, καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς τότ' ἂν με δικαίως
εἰσάγοι τις εἰς δικαστήριον, ὅτι οὐ νομίζω
θεοὺς εἶναι ἀπειθῶν τῇ μαντείᾳ καὶ δεδιῶς
θάνατον καὶ οἰόμενος σοφὸς εἶναι οὐκ ὦν. Τὸ
γάρ τοι θάνατον δεδιέναι, ὦ ἄνδρες, οὐδὲν ἄλλο
ἐστὶν ἢ δοκεῖν σοφὸν εἶναι μὴ ὄντα.

Tests upon a number of students revealed the fact that some of them were unconscious of Plato's nice distinction in the use of οὐκ and μὴ respectively with the participles ὦν and ὄντα, and that others had in vain tried to read a conditional force into μὴ ὄντα. The latter deserved the credit, at least, of loyalty to their Greek grammars. A running of all the references in Goodwin and Hadley affords no help in this case. The various annotated editions call no attention to the distinction, and even Schleiermacher mistranslates μὴ ὄντα by *ut non sit*.

It is impossible, of course, for the smaller grammars to provide for the *loci* even in constructions where the line of demarkation is rather sharp—as is the case with μὴ and οὐ in classic Greek—but it would seem practicable to make some extra provision for μὴ and οὐ with the participle.

It is not sufficient to say, "When a participle expresses a *condition*, it takes μὴ; otherwise it takes οὐ" (Goodwin, § 1612; also Hadley, § 1025); nor to add, "The regular negative of the infinitive and participle in indirect discourse is οὐ, but exceptions occur" (Goodwin, § 1496), for if the present μὴ were a mere exception, an identity of *meaning* with οὐ would be implied; nor to add with Hadley (§ 1027), "μὴ is often used instead of οὐ with participles or other words, through an influence of the verbs on which they depend, when these verbs either have μὴ, or would have it, if negative," for μὴ ὄντα is not, logically, dependent upon δοκεῖν: it is, rather, co-ordinate in thought with δοκεῖν, being practically equivalent to μηδὲ εἶναι (*neque esse*), and echoing the well-known μὴ δοκεῖν, ἀλλ' εἶναι.

And thus it is the *equivalence* that brings the phrase under the infinitival construction which requires the negative μὴ. Similarly, *Anab.* iv. 3. 28: κελεῖται μέναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ μὴ διαβάντας (= καὶ μὴ διαβῆσαι). And *Lys.* xii. 68: ὑπέσχετο δ' εἰρήνην ποιήσειν μήθ' ὄμηρα δοὺς μήτε τὰ τεῖχη καθελόν.

In the same way, a student readily understands how a participle takes the

negative *μή* by reason of its *equivalence* to the imperative whose negative is *μή*, e.g., ἀπάγου τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τοὺς παῖδας μὴδὲν αὐτῶν καταθείς (Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 47), where *μὴδὲν καταθείς* equals *καὶ μὴδὲν καταθείς*.

The *equivalence idea* probably would have smoothed the way for an approximately correct translation of our passage: "For the fear of death is only apparent wisdom and not true wisdom." I say approximately correct, for those who have "the linguistic sense" are aware of a circumstantial notion in the *μὴ ὄντα*, which defies translation.

HORACE L. JONES

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED *ICHNEUTAI* OF SOPHOCLES

The dry lands and well-nigh rainless climate of Egypt have conspired to give us in these later centuries a series of glad surprises. For centuries Egypt was the headquarters of Greek literature. Here were preserved the treasures of that great literature long after Athens had sunk to the level of a provincial city with academic traditions.

A great mass of these documents is made up of royal ordinances, private and public letters, customs, regulations, prescriptions, legal and business documents of every conceivable sort, marriage and divorce notices, invitations to weddings, banquets, and entertainments—from imperial decrees to grocery and meat bills. The life of the common man has been restored, the history of the Christian church has been cleared up on more than one point, the gap between Plato and Paul or even modern Greek has in large measure been spanned, and the continuity of history assured.

More than a score of familiar authors are among the found, as Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, Thucydides, Lysias, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Sappho, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Alcman, Theocritus, Euclid, and Callimachus. Other names appear, as Theopompus, whose work seems to join on to Thucydides; Bacchylides, who ranked among the nine lyric poets recognized by the Alexandrian critics; Chariton, Epicharmus, Philemon, Hippias, Theophrastus, Anaximenes, Aristoxenus, Isaeus, besides numerous works whose writers are still among the illustrious unknown.

In the case of Sophocles the discovery is almost unique, being paralleled only by a single piece from Euripides. As is well known, it was a custom among the Greek tragedians to produce tragedies in trilogies, or sets of three, following the trilogy with a play in lighter strain, thus letting down as it were the wrought-up feelings of the auditors. The only such satyric drama previously known was the *Cyclops* of Euripides. But from the other great tragedians there remained only disjointed sentences and fragments of such works preserved largely in the grammarians. But now have been brought to light over four hundred lines of a comic detective play, *Ichneutai* (*The Trackers*), probably a half or more of the entire play.